

Attorney Docket No. P71376US0
Application No. 10/586,138

Remarks:

Applicants wish to thank the examiner for the timely indication of allowable subject matter (discussed below).

The specification is amended to insert the heading "Brief Description of the Drawings."

Claims 1 and 3-20 are pending.

Claims 15-19 stand withdrawn, pursuant to restriction.

Claim 2 is canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claim 1 is amended by incorporating claim 2, therein, i.e., present (amended) claim 1 corresponds to original claim 2; and, present claims 3-20 being dependent (directly or indirectly) on present claim 1, present claims 3-20 likewise incorporate the subject matter of original claim 2. 35 USC 112, ¶4. Claim 1 is also amended to more clearly define the invention, i.e., by changing "representative of" to "representing." Claims 6 and 7 are amended, hereby, to more clearly define the invention, i.e., by changing "inductance" (each occurrence) to "induction coil."

New claim 20 defines subject matter found in original claim 5, i.e., the subject matter of original claim 5 is divided, hereby, into present (amended) claim 5 and (new) claim 20.

The aforesaid claim amendments are appropriately submitted—and entered in the record—after final rejection. As explained below, the instant amendments place the application in condition for allowance, pursuant to the final Office Action.

Claims 2-4 and 9-14 define subject matter found allowable over the prior art, according to the Office Action.

Attorney Docket No. P71376US0
Application No. 10/586,138

Claims 5 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2, for allegedly being indefinite. Reconsideration is requested.

The rejection as applied to claim 7 is overcome, in that the allegedly indefinite language (i.e., "close to") is not found in present (amended) claim 7.

In view of the foregoing remarks, the rejection of claims 5 and 7 rejected under §112, ¶2, for allegedly being indefinite is overcome. Withdrawal of the rejection is in order.

Claims 1 and 5-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for allegedly being unpatentable over DE 41 14 398 (Karlheinz) in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,200,399 (Gottfried). Reconsideration is requested.

The rejection is rendered moot by the foregoing claim amendments. The rejected claims are, now, limited to the subject matter of original claim 2, i.e., the subject matter of present (amended) claim 1, found allowable by the PTO. Accordingly, present claims 1 and 5-7 are allowable over the prior art. *In re Fine*, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

In view of the foregoing remarks, the rejection of claims 1 and 5-7 under §103(a), for allegedly being unpatentable over Karlheinz and Gottfried is overcome. Withdrawal of the rejection is in order.

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for allegedly being unpatentable over Karlheinz, Gottfried and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,032,065 (Brown). Reconsideration is requested.

Attorney Docket No. P71376US0
Application No. 10/586,138

The rejection is rendered moot by the foregoing claim amendments. The rejected claim, by virtue of being dependent upon present (amended) claim 1, incorporates the subject matter of original claim 2, found allowable by the PTO. Accordingly, present claim 8 is allowable over the prior art. *Fine, supra.*

In view of the foregoing remarks, the rejection of claim 8 under §103(a), for allegedly being unpatentable over Karlheinz, Gottfried, and Brown is overcome. Withdrawal of the rejection is in order.

The objection to claims 2-4 and 9-14 is overcome, in that the rejection of the base claim—on which the objection relied—is overcome, as explained above.

Favorable action is requested.

Respectfully submitted,



William E. Player
Reg. No. 31,409
Attorney of Record

JACOBSON HOLMAN PLLC
400 Seventh Street, NW
The Jenifer Building
Washington, D.C. 20004
Tel. (202) 638-6666
Fax (202) 393-5350
Date: December 21, 2011
WEP/mwg

H:\wep&secretary\2011\December\P71376US0 amd.wpd